Form revised: February 26, 2014

## FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

Department:	Contact Person/Phone:	CBO Analyst/Phone:
Law	Richard Greene 684-8538	

### **Legislation Title:**

AN ORDINANCE relating to the City's traffic code; amending various sections and subsections in and adding sections to Chapters 11.22, 11.31, 11.34, 11.56, 11.57, 11.64, 11.66 and 11.82 and repealing sections 11.66.060, 11.66.080 and 11.66.100 of the Seattle Municipal Code to conform with changes in state law.

### **Summary of the Legislation:**

This ordinance eliminates the requirement that a vehicle seller deliver to the purchaser the license plates for the vehicle, clarifies the scope of use for automated traffic safety cameras, provides that hulk hauler license plate restrictions, cancelling a traffic citation and failing to yield to a blind pedestrian are criminal violations, requires that the sentence for certain traffic crimes run consecutively, allows a motorcycle to disregard a traffic control device under certain circumstances and changes the conditions under which warning flags are required on a projecting load. It also adds to the traffic code a provision prohibiting blocking a train and eliminates several provisions that were determined by *City of Seattle v. Burlington Northern Railroad Co.*, 145 Wn.2d 661, 41 P.3d 1169 (2002), to be preempted by federal law.

#### **Background:**

This ordinance is designed to make changes to Seattle's traffic code to reflect changes made to identical state statutes by the 2014 Legislature and to correct other inconsistencies between state traffic statutes and our traffic code. It also enacts a provision prohibiting blocking a train and eliminates several provisions regarding trains that were declared invalid by the Washington Supreme Court.

X This legislation does not have any financial implications.

# **Other Implications:**

- a) Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications? No.
- b) What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation? None seems apparent.
- c) Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department? This ordinance would affect the Seattle Police Department as it is responsible for enforcement.
- d) What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or

Richard Greene LAW 2014 Traffic ORD November 26, 2014 Version #2

similar objectives? None seems apparent.

- e) Is a public hearing required for this legislation? No.
- f) Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation? No.
- g) Does this legislation affect a piece of property? No.
- h) Other Issues: